

REMARKS

In the present amendment, claims 1-15 have been cancelled, new claims 18-28 have been added, and withdrawn claims 16 and 17 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 16-28 are pending in the application with claim 18 being independent.

Applicants note that new claims 18-28 replace cancelled claims 1-15.

Withdrawn claims 16 and 17 have been amended to better comply with idiomatic English and standard U.S. practice.

No new matter has been added.

Restriction Requirement

The Restriction Requirement has been maintained, and the requirement has been made final. Applicants are maintaining claims 16 and 17 pending, subject to possible rejoinder.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner has not considered the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 18, 2006, stating that it is not in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(a)(1), because copies of the foreign references (cited on the International Search Report) had not been provided and no copies had been received from the International Bureau. Applicants note that an Information Disclosure Statement is submitted concurrently with this response again citing the documents of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 18, 2006 and making four additional documents of record. Copies of the documents listed on Form PTO-1449 are enclosed, with exception of the U.S. patent and U.S. patent application publication.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initial the appropriate spaces on the attached Form PTO-1449, and to return a copy of the completed Form to Applicants with the next official communication in the present application.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objects to the abstract of the present disclosure, noting standard requirements and that the abstract was not provided on a separate sheet.

Applicants submit with this response an amended abstract on a separate sheet. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claims 1-15 based on several informalities.

Applicants note that claims 1-15 have been cancelled and corresponding new claims 18-28 have been added to better comply with idiomatic English and standard U.S. practice.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Applicants note that the rejection of claims 8, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 1-15 and presenting new corresponding claims 18 - 28.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Applicants note that the rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 1-15 and the addition of new corresponding claims 18 - 28.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6, and 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by US 2004/0038049 to Suzuki et al., hereinafter "SUZUKI."

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Applicants submit that in an attempt to advance prosecution of the present application and without expressing agreement with or acquiescence to the rejection, claims 1-15 have been cancelled and new claims 18-28 have been added to render the rejection moot.

Applicants respectfully point out that SUZUKI does not disclose or suggest all elements of present independent claim 18, i.e., "an electrodeposited copper foil with carrier foil on which a resin layer for forming an insulating layer is formed, comprising: a carrier foil; a bonding interface layer formed on top of the carrier foil; an electrodeposited copper foil layer formed on top of the resin layer having a surface roughness (Rzjis) on both sides of less than 2 μm ; a rust proofing layer comprising a nickel-zinc alloy formed on top of the electrodeposited copper foil layer; and a resin layer formed on top of the rust proofing layer, wherein the resin layer comprises: a) 20 to 80 parts by weight of an epoxy resin including a curing agent; b) 20 to 80 parts by weight of a solvent soluble aromatic polyamide resin polymer of; and c) optionally a curing accelerator."

Specifically, Applicants note that SUZUKI does not teach an insulating resin layer on top of a rust proofing layer, whereby the insulating resin layer is further characterized by a specific organic resin composition, i.e., 20 to 80 parts by weight of an epoxy resin including a curing agent, 20 to 80 parts by weight of a solvent soluble aromatic polyamide resin polymer of, and optionally a curing accelerator.

Moreover, SUZUKI clearly teaches that the copper electroplating layer 4 (which allegedly corresponds to the presently claimed electrodeposited copper foil layer) is roughened, see, e.g., SUZUKI, paragraph [0075]. In contrast to SUZUKI, the presently claimed invention does not apply roughening treatment and recites "an electrodeposited copper foil layer formed on top of the bonding interface layer having a surface roughness (R_{zjs}) on both sides of less than 2 μm ." Applicants note that the Examiner refers to SUZUKI, paragraph [0072] as support for a teaching that SUZUKI also discloses smooth surfaces. However, this teaching in SUZUKI does not relate to the electrodeposited copper layer 4 but to the carrier foil 1 and must be read in context with the preceeding paragraph [0071].

In view of the above, because SUZUKI does not teach all elements of the presently claimed invention, withdrawal of the anticipation rejection over SUZUKI is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action makes the following claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

- claim 7, as allegedly being obvious over SUZUKI;
- claim 9, as allegedly being obvious over SUZUKI; and

- claims 2-5, as allegedly being obvious over SUZUKI in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,905,757 to Matsushima, hereinafter MATSUSHIMA.

Applicants note that the rejections of claims 2-5, 7, and 9 are based on the assumption that claim 1 is anticipated by SUZUKI. In view of the cancellation of claims 1-15, new claims 18-28 and foregoing discussion, Applicants emphasize that present independent claim 18 is not anticipated by SUZUKI, wherefore the obviousness rejections are also without basis.


Accordingly, withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is respectfully requested as well.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the objections rejections of record, and allow each of the pending claims.

If any issues yet remain which can be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
Seiji NAGATANI


William S. Boshnick
Reg. No. 44,550

December 2, 2009
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191

Stephen M. Roylance
Reg. No. 31,296